

Blanchard, Deborah

From: Josh Ziel [jz12b@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 8:56 AM
To: Blanchard, Deborah; Justin Walsh; Aaron Robbins; greg lammy; kevinhfleming@hotmail.com
Subject: My Opposition to S.B. 1094

Good Morning Ms Blanchard

Last week, Senator Meyer stated that the only reason to have 'high' capacity magazines is "for criminal purposes." I hope this was taken out of context. Is he putting me in the same category as armed robbers and murderous gang members, by stating that the possession of a magazine capable of holding more than 10 rounds shows I possess criminal intent? The basis for his support of this bill is founded in ignorance and directed by emotion, not logic and rational thought.

I hope the honorable members of the committee can see this bill for what it is - an imposition on the personal liberties of the People.

I am the proud father of two beautiful children. I am a veteran of the Connecticut Army National Guard, and I am a valid Connecticut State Pistol Permit holder. I have the right to life, liberty, and property, and it is my duty to protect those basic fundamental rights.

I find it appalling that if this bill passes, law-abiding gun owners will have to begin surrendering their standard capacity magazines by July, or face confiscation by the state police and a felony charge. Again, this proposal would not only ban the sale of these magazines, but would make simple possession a felony. Any gun owner (including off-duty police officers) found in possession of any magazine capable of holding more than 10 rounds will be in violation of this proposed law, regardless of whether it was legally purchased. In the meantime, criminals will have the ability to travel a couple hours in any direction, and legally purchase these magazines.

This bill will not protect citizens, nor reduce crime. Criminals by nature will have no concern for this law. FBI researcher Ed Davis published a study in 2006 on the Felonious Assaults on Law Enforcement Officers. Mr Davis found that "the offenders laughed at firearms laws". This bill is a threat to the rights of law abiding citizens, and will tip the scales in the criminals' favor. Even is an individual with evil intent were limited to 10 round magazines, what prevents this monster from carrying multiple handguns? Three guns is equal to thirty rounds. No reloading necessary. Nothing slowing the monster down. An arbitrary limitation on the number of rounds is not the answer to preventing gun violence of any kind. **CRIMINALS HAVE NO RESPECT FOR THE LAW.**

We are talking about restricting the rights of the majority due to the actions of the small minority. Clearly not the way the Founding Fathers intended for our country to be governed.

This bill will also affect non-gun owners as all Connecticut tax payers will be

forced to foot the bill for the extraordinary process of having police confiscated - from law-abiding citizens - the millions of magazines already in the state. Making matters worse, manufacturers including Colt, C Products, Mec-Gar, OKAY Industries and Metalform will be directly affected by this legislation. That means a loss of jobs and tax revenue to the state.

Arbitrarily limiting magazine capacity and threatening law-abiding gun owners with confiscation and felony charges is beyond the pale. These magazines are utilized every day for home defense and the shooting sports. As part of the 1994 "Assault Weapons" ban, the production of higher capacity magazines was halted. This gun-control strategy soon proved to be a failure. A comprehensive study by the Centers for Disease Control -- hardly a pro-gun entity - looked at the full panoply of gun-control measures, including this ban, and concluded that none could be proven to reduce crime. Another study, commissioned by Congress, found that bans were not effective since "the banned weapons and magazines were never used in more than a modest fraction of all gun murders."

Please listen to the voices of the people. The majority of the people in Connecticut are against this bill. The violence in Arizona and the incident at Hartford Distributors were both terrible tragedies. However, banning magazines, and confiscating personal property is a crime against the freedoms I served my country to protect.

Sincerely,

Joshua Ziel
Coventry, CT